

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 12

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte ARTHUR N. WOO

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

ON BRIEF

Before THOMAS, JERRY SMITH, and GROSS, Administrative Patent Judges.  
GROSS, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal from the examiner's final rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8.

Appellant's invention relates to a GPS navigation system with a database of maps stored in a portable document format (PDF) file independent of any hardware, software and operating system used to create the database. Claim 4 is illustrative of the claimed invention, and it reads as follows:

4. An improved GPS navigation receiver for converting information from microwave radio transmissions from orbiting satellites and for determining a position-of-the-receiver from a



Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

the examiner. As a consequence of our review, we will affirm the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8.

Appellant's arguments are primarily directed to the combinability of Adobe's PDF format and hyperlinks with Steiner's system. Appellant states (Brief, page 6) that the examiner "offered vague and superficial reasons to make the combination," and that the "alleged benefits could be applied to anything in any situation." Appellant continues that the combination is based on hindsight, as "there is nothing specific ... that would compel an artisan to take Steiner, et al., in particular, and select for combination the PDF format found in Adobe." Appellant also contends (Brief, page 9) that the references themselves do not articulate the motivation for combining.

We disagree. Steiner (column 2, lines 1-4) discloses that electronic maps are stored either as bit maps or vectors that point to map characters. Further, Steiner states (column 2, lines 14-17) that bitmaps are easier to develop and are more accurate, but vector maps require less memory and are more easily sorted for features and attributes. Thus, Steiner suggests the desire for the benefits of a bit map while reducing the amount of data required and having the ability to sort for features and attributes.

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

Appellant admits in the specification (page 5) that PostScript was developed as an improvement to bitmapping to reduce the volume of data to communicate printing information to a laserprinter. As Steiner suggests a need to reduce the amount of data required, it would have been obvious in view of appellant's admissions to use PostScript in Steiner's system.

Further, Adobe teaches (page 1) that PDF improves performance over PostScript for interactive viewing. Steiner includes user entry 38 for interactive viewing, such as for requesting information about a particular portion on the display (see column 10, lines 18-24), and, as indicated above, desires the ability to sort for data easily. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use PDF instead of PostScript for further improvement in interactive viewing. In other words, appellant's admissions together with the teachings in the references provide the motivation to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. The level of the skilled artisan should not be underestimated. See In re Sovish, 769 F.2d 738, 743, 226 USPQ 771, 774 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Further, contrary to appellant's assertion (Brief, page 6) that the arts of the references are unrelated, appellant's admissions and Adobe address the same problems set forth in Steiner and are, therefore, related thereto.

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

Appellant's remaining arguments are directed to hypertext links. Such hypertext links, however, are recited only in independent claims 1 and 8, not in independent claim 4. Therefore, we will sustain the obviousness rejection of claim 4. We also will sustain the rejection of claim 5, since appellant has grouped it with claim 4 (Brief, page 3).

As to the additional arguments for claims 1 and 8, appellant asserts (Brief, page 7) that the rejection "fails to recognize that both [where the hypertext links are placed and what they do when activated] are very specific issues in the claimed present invention." Appellant points to claim 1's recitation of hyperlinks to structures represented in the area maps in the PDF file of the database as claimed subject matter lacking from the combination of references.

Adobe teaches (page 1) that PDF includes hyperlink capability which is useful for interactive viewing. We above determined that Steiner suggests interactive viewing with the user entry 38. Thus, it would have been obvious to use hyperlinks for connecting to the information requested with user entry 38 to assist in the interactive viewing. In particular, the skilled artisan would have found it obvious to place the hypertext links at the various

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

structures/features on the maps (i.e., the features for which Steiner discloses needing to sort easily), and to activate the hypertext links with user entry 38. Again, one should not underestimate the level of the skilled artisan. See id.

Last, appellant argues (Brief, page 8) that the zoom keys of Steiner differ in structure and function because of the relationship to the hyperlinks. However, the addition of hyperlinks to Steiner in light of Adobe would necessarily require modification to Steiner's zoom keys to make them compatible with the additional features. Accordingly, we find appellant's arguments to be unpersuasive, and we will affirm the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8.

#### CONCLUSION

The decision of the examiner rejecting claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is affirmed.

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a).

AFFIRMED

JAMES D. THOMAS	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
JERRY SMITH	)	APPEALS
Administrative Patent Judge	)	AND
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
	)	
	)	
ANITA PELLMAN GROSS	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

Appeal No. 1998-2003  
Application No. 08/440,246

THOMAS E SCHATZEL  
16400 LARK AVENUE  
SUITE 300  
LOS GATOS, CA 95032-2547